DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 985 SO 032 059

AUTHOR Jacobs, Victoria R.
TITLE What Happens When the Artistic World and a Teacher's World Meet?
SPONS AGENCY John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Spencer Foundation, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000). For a related paper, see SO 032 057.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Appreciation; *Artists; Curriculum Research; Elementary Education; Instructional Innovation; Integrated Curriculum; *Professional Development; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

This paper explores a six-year-old professional development program in which "professional artists" help teachers learn how to integrate the arts into their curriculum The specific goal of the program is to help teachers learn to use the arts to teach the content areas of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The paper explains that for two years each teacher is visited weekly by a professional artist who serves as a coach, collaborating with each teacher to further the teacher's curriculum objectives and professional development plans. The paper points out that tensions often arise as the coaches try to help the teachers incorporate the artistic process into an already full curriculum. It concludes by identifying structural components of the SUAVE program (California) that seem to have mitigated many of the potentially negative effects of these tensions and instead have turned them into opportunities for teacher learning. (Contains 22 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 985

What Happens When the Artistic World and a Teacher's World Meet?

Jacobs, Victoria R.

SO 032 059

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Victoria Jacobs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Happens When the Artistic World and a Teacher's World Meet?

Victoria R. Jacobs
San Diego State University

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
April 2000, New Orleans, LA

> An important goal should be to expand the community of educators and education resources to which teachers turn to inform and support their work, a shift from the pattern in which teachers focus exclusively on their own work or the work of those close by, with little external contribution, challenge or support (Ball & Cohen, 1999, pp. 18-19)

Ball and Cohen (1999) underscore the necessity of involving experts outside the field of education in the goal of improving education. This paper explores a six-year-old professional development program that involves *professional artists* to help teachers learn how to integrate the arts into their curriculum. Specifically, the goal of the program is to help teachers learn to use the arts to teach the content areas of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. In addition, this approach helps both teachers and students develop an appreciation for the arts in and of themselves. For two years, each teacher is visited weekly by a professional artist who serves as a coach. The coach does not provide pre-determined art activities, but rather collaborates with each teacher to further that teacher's curriculum objectives and professional development goals.

This program has been remarkably successful both in terms of teacher learning and teacher satisfaction, yet these teacher-artist collaborations have not been without tensions. First, teachers typically work in a culture that supports autonomy and equality, and thus

The research reported in this paper was assisted by a joint grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Spencer Foundation under the Professional Development Research and Documentation Program. The data presented, the statements made, and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the author.

teachers are used to working in their own classrooms without contributions or critiques from others (Little, 1990; McClure, 1999). Similarly, when artists typically work in schools, they do so autonomously as specialists (Goldberg, 1997). Thus, given the unfamiliarity of teachers and artists meeting in collaboration, this professional development program forces these players to negotiate what form the collaboration should take, and in doing so, tensions often arise. Second, collaborations with individuals outside of education require the melding of two professional worlds, each with their own goals, values, and typical practices. Teachers exist in a world of content standards, mandatory testing, and results-driven rewards and policies. These conditions encourage teachers' actions to be both time-conscious and objective-driven (McClure, 1999; Sparks & Hirsch, 1997). In contrast, artists value the artistic process, a process of creation that requires spontaneity and time for exploration (Bennett, Goldberg, Jacobs & Wendling, 1999; Goldberg, 1997). Tensions often arise as the coaches try to help the teachers incorporate the artistic process into a curriculum that is already full.

This paper explores these two sources of tension that commonly occur when the artistic world and a teacher's world meet in collaboration. Before describing the arts-integration program and investigating these sources of tension, two caveats are required. First, these tensions did not occur in all teacher-coach collaborations or all lessons. Rather, the paper highlights the tensions that arose most often and across a wide range of lessons and teacher-coach pairs. Second, although tensions can create anxiety and frustration, all tensions should not be viewed as negative. In many cases, tensions can provide exceptional opportunities for growth, and research has suggested that a certain amount of uncertainty or difficulty is necessary for substantial (vs. superficial) teacher

learning to occur (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Fullan, 1999; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Goldberg, Bennett, & Jacobs, 1999; Thompson & Zeuli, 1999). Thus, this paper concludes by identifying structural components of the SUAVE program that seem to have mitigated many of the potentially negative effects of these tensions and instead have turned them into opportunities for teacher learning.

The Professional Development Program: SUAVE

SUAVE (Socios Unidos para Artes via Educación, or, United Community for Arts in Education) is a volunteer professional development program that was developed by Merryl Goldberg as a collaboration among the California Center for the Arts - Escondido, California State University San Marcos, and several local school districts in Southern California (Goldberg & Bossenmeyer, 1998). The philosophy underlying the program is that teaching *through* the arts (vs. the more traditional teaching *about* the arts) can be a powerful pedagogical tool for teachers to help students both further their subject-matter understanding and be introduced to the arts themselves (ASCD Curriculum Update, 1998; Goldberg, 1997). SUAVE currently involves 12 coaches and 120 teachers from over 20 schools across 5 districts. For the first two years of participation, a school site selects ten teachers to participate in inservices and weekly coaching sessions. The goal at the end of two years is that teachers will have gained the ability and desire to continue teaching through the arts. After two years, teachers no longer have a coach in their classroom weekly, yet they are still provided with some limited opportunities to participate in after-school workshops, attend inservices, and work with coaches in their classrooms.

Inservices. SUAVE provides five full-day inservices per year for all districts participating in SUAVE . During these inservices, teachers share curriculum, attend performances, and learn arts-based activities from local and visiting artists, many of whom are performing at the California Center for the Arts - Escondido (e.g., the COAD puppetry company, the Shakespeare Company, and Marcel Marceau).

Weekly coaching. The core of SUAVE is its coaching component whereby a professional artist (the coach) visits each teacher's classroom one hour per week for two years. The coaches themselves are also supported through weekly meetings with the program director. SUAVE is designed so that ten teachers per school site participate with the same coach. The coaches rotate yearly so that each teacher has an opportunity to work with two coaches. These coaches do not try to implement a set of pre-planned art activities. Rather, their task is to collaborate with teachers to further *the teachers'* curriculum objectives and professional development goals.

In contrast to a traditional coaching model in which the coach would be the "expert" and the teacher a "novice," SUAVE views teachers as an integral part of successful classroom coaching. While coaches bring professional knowledge about the arts (e.g., techniques, creativity, multiple modes of communication, and a curiosity for exploring the world), teachers bring professional knowledge about teaching and the students in their classrooms (e.g., curriculum knowledge, classroom management skills, age-appropriate expectations, and a rapport with specific students in that classroom). These two players then collaborate to design lessons that teach curriculum through the arts. These lessons are customized for a particular topic and particular students (vs. a prescribed curriculum). They are also designed so that they are appropriate for the

comfort level and ability level of the teacher and coach involved. This collaboration often creates instruction that is substantially better than either player feels capable of producing alone (Bennett et al., 1999).

Data for This Paper

The data for this paper were collected during the first year of a three-year study investigating SUAVE coaching as a professional development model. The research team observed and videotaped four consecutive months of arts-integrated lessons (during the weekly coaching sessions) in ten K-5 classrooms in four elementary schools. At that time, these ten target teachers were in their second and final year of weekly coaching. In addition, teachers and coaches from all SUAVE schools completed written surveys and were interviewed either individually or in focus groups.

Potential Tensions

The SUAVE program has been successful in bringing together the artists' and teachers' worlds in collaboration. Indicators of success include the program's longevity, consistent funding, and continued expansion (i.e. expanding from 3 schools and 30 teachers to over 20 schools and 120 teachers with more on a waiting list) (Goldberg, in press). On an individual level, teachers have credited SUAVE with helping them grow both professionally and personally. However, despite the program's success, tensions have surfaced for both the teachers and artists. The fact that SUAVE has been successful in helping teachers grow suggests that these tensions did not serve as drawbacks but

rather as productive catalysts for teacher's learning[1]. Therefore, the next section explores both the successes of SUAVE and the potential tensions in these teacher-artist collaborations. It is necessary to first describe SUAVE's successes in order to frame the subsequent tensions as *positive* learning opportunities rather than just sources of frustration.

Success of SUAVE

SUAVE has provided teachers with opportunities to learn and at the same time created an atmosphere of excitement, encouragement, and resources that promoted widespread participation and a feeling of being professional and a part of something special. Teachers typically described two ways that SUAVE helped them grow: professionally and personally.

Professional growth. Through their participation in SUAVE, teachers have learned a variety of artistic techniques that have helped them more easily teach using the arts. However, most of the teachers gained much more than techniques; they grew to believe in the power of teaching through the arts. They no longer viewed arts as "fluff" or something extra that should only be included on a Friday afternoon. Instead, they recognized the power of the arts to help students learn deeply. As one fourth-grade teacher stated: "It is a great way to enhance what you're teaching rather than take time away from the core subjects."

Teachers' belief in the power of the arts was often strengthened by the success of the arts with some of their students who otherwise struggled with school. For example, a sixth-grade teacher described how the arts helped, in her words, "a particularly difficult

[1] The SUAVE program was designed to enhance teachers' understandings, although both teachers and coaches have learned from their participation in the program. This paper focuses on the tensions that

young sixth grader" become interested in learning science. This student typically did not turn in work on time and often struggled with both reading and writing English. The turning point came when he was given an opportunity to draw a cell seen under a microscope. The teacher discovered that this student was a talented artist, and because he had drawn the cell, he was motivated and able to write a high-quality reflection on how the shape of the cell was related to the function of the organism. Subsequently, this student turned in all his lab assignments on time. The teacher felt that *the student's drawings* had "bridged the language/content gap!" Similar academic successes with the arts encouraged many teachers to change their planning techniques to include what one first-grade teacher called "the SUAVE question." She now asks herself: "Is there a way to bring art through here that will enhance the concept and get the learning across in a better way?"

In addition to enhancing the learning of academic content, teachers often identified other benefits of incorporating the arts. This fourth-grade teacher reflected on both her learning and her student's learning after a coach had encouraged a resource student to participate in a drama activity. This student, who normally would not get in front of the class, was able to participate happily and successfully:

> This was a magical moment for my student, but it was also a magical moment for *me*. HEAVEN FORBID that I *ever* treat any of my students as LESSER – and I mean that with all sincerity, yet when I saw the encouragement and confidence by the leader [coach] in this student, he was able to do it. This moment just reminded me – a wake-up call – to be sure, in my own heart, that I really believe *all* my students are *very* gifted and talented. (fourth-grade teacher)

Personal growth. In addition to growth in their teaching philosophies and techniques, many of the SUAVE teachers recognized that their own interest in the arts

---

influence *teachers'* learning. Thus, coaches' issues are included only as they relate to teachers' learning.

increased. For example, they were more likely to see a play or visit a museum exhibit. Perhaps most striking was that many teachers grew to recognize the artist in themselves.

> I grew up believing I had no artistic talent whatsoever and I grew up in a family of sisters that did have a lot of artistic talent – totally convinced that I could not draw, nor paint, nor create anything on my own – and my first year with [the coach] completely changed my mind. She truly believed that every person could learn to draw something, and I figured out the first day that if I didn't believe that, then I couldn't teach any of my children to draw. And so I watched, …changed my beliefs, and bought an art tablet, and took a few lessons, bought a few books, and spent a lot of time trying to draw what [the coach] had taught me. And, believe it or not, I really can draw. Now when I tell children they're going to learn to draw something, paint something, sing something, create something, I truly believe that I can do it and they can do it, and then they really do accomplish it, and I think that's something I did not believe until [the coach] came into my room. (first-grade teacher)

This self-recognition of teachers' artistic talent was important because, in essence, it allowed teachers to redefine who could do art and thus be an artist. This redefinition helped teachers further integrate the arts into their curriculum and believe in the power of the arts for *all* students. For a case study of one teacher's discovery of her own artistic identity, see the upcoming chapter by Jacobs, Goldberg, and Bennett (in press).

Despite these testimonies about professional and personal growth, SUAVE teachers have also recognized two major sources of tension: (a) working collaboratively with artists since teachers are used to working alone and expecting artists who serve as specialists to also work alone, and (b) incorporating the artistic process into the teachers' typical approach that is more time-conscious and objective-driven. These tensions were not the result of an ineffective program but rather part of a successful program that used tensions to help teachers learn.

Collaboration with Artists

The privacy and individualism of teaching was brought to the forefront of educational discussions with Lortie's (1975) analysis in *Schoolteacher*. Two decades later, while many educators are promoting collaboration, researchers still find that individualism dominates the culture of teaching (see, for example, Ball & Cohen, 1999; Hargreaves, 1994; Little, 1990; Little & McLaughlin, 1993). Furthermore, while all collaboration challenges the prevailing norms, collaboration with artists creates some specific obstacles.

First, while artists have long played a role in education, they have typically served as artists-in-residence or specialists who visit schools for short periods of time in order to complete particular projects (Goldberg, 1997) In this role, teachers and artists rarely collaborate (for a notable exception, see Upitis, Soren & Smithrim, 1998). Rather, the artists teach classes and the teachers, who are often not even present, have little or no responsibility. One SUAVE teacher described this perspective as it was her initial expectation of working with a SUAVE coach:

> In the past, we've had an art teacher who comes in, and each time that she comes in, she teaches the class, and you either participate and observe with her, or many teachers graded papers or did other activities while they were in there…but the [art] teacher did all of the teaching. She did the classroom management and it was hands-off. (4/5 multi-grade teacher)

Second, in our society, many believe that while everyone can appreciate and enjoy the arts, only professional artists have the expertise necessary to create them. This belief has worked against the average layperson believing in the possibility that *everyone* can create art and that this process can be a powerful learning experience. Only recently have educators begun to recognize that the role of the arts in education can extend beyond

teaching *about* the arts. Based on the assumption that art is a process in which everyone can participate, educators are now suggesting that the arts can also be powerful teaching techniques to further understanding outside of the arts (ASCD Curriculum Update, 1998; CDE Arts Work, 1997; Goldberg, 1997).

The teachers' view of artists as a select group, the traditional role of arts specialists, and the dominant culture of individualism in teaching all provided challenges for the teachers and coaches who were asked to collaborate. SUAVE is designed as a collaboration between two professionals, both with valuable expertise to bring to the collaboration. In operationalizing this view of collaboration, tensions often arose for both teachers and coaches.

Teacher concerns. Many teachers initially viewed the collaboration as simply an extension of the artist as specialist rather than as a collaborative endeavor. For example, this fourth-grade teacher still expected that the artist would have all the responsibility and expertise. The only difference would be that she would try and learn from the artist rather than using the visit as free time (as often happens with artists serving as specialists).

> With a coach I would have *expectations* of leading me, because the end goal that I would see is, next year, leaving me where I can take and do on my own. So my expectations were that the coaches [would] give me things and let me watch and help me train and do all these things. ....because *now* the coach has the expertise... that's why they're the coach. (fourth-grade teacher)

Similarly, a fifth-grade teacher described how her view of the weekly coaching had to evolve. At the beginning, she expected the coach to provide lots of techniques, yet the coach did not have or give all the answers. Rather, the teacher and coach worked together to make decisions and teach lessons. Initially, this teacher admitted that she was

disappointed that the coaching proved to be more of a partnership. However, upon later reflection, she felt that through her *participation*, she was actually better able to take ownership over the learning that occurred.

> We [teachers at that school] were actually disappointed at first, because we kept thinking "So when are they [the coaches] going to come in and teach us these great techniques?" and that's what we were expecting. . . . You think it's going to be a directed art lesson, sort of directed to me, as the teacher. But I'm looking back and I think I'm glad it wasn't that way because now I can take ownership on what we learned . . . and I'm more comfortable. . . . I feel like I probably learned more this way than if they had said "OK, this is what you're going to do. You're going to do A first, then B, then C." (fifth-grade teacher)

The mismatch between the teachers' expectations and SUAVE's design of collaborative coaching sometimes caused tensions. These tensions were not only felt by the teachers, but also by the artists.

Artist concerns. Several of the artists struggled with the teachers' expectations that the artists were the experts in charge. For example, one artist explained:

> I don't want to be in the position that says "I know more than you ," or "You're going to follow me because I have an expertise." … What I see is I bring stuff. I bring things, ideas, and they happen. They happen more out of some kind of an organic process more than me pushing anything. (coach)

This artist particularly disliked the idea of hierarchy in a collaborative relationship. Another artist expressed his general discomfort with being considered an expert. This coach had expertise in drama, music, and visual arts, and considered himself to be a "folk artist" (as compared to some of the other coaches who were more formally trained in the arts).

> We're considered experts. People call me expert in music or whatever, but really I'm not an expert. I'm not an expert in dance. I'm not an expert in much. I'm not an expert in any arts areas – it happens that I have certain experiences, and I'm sharing that with the teachers. (coach)

It is not that this artist felt a lack of things to share with the teachers. On the contrary, he was excited to share his artistic talents although, according to some of the teachers, he did not always know how to best interact with teachers and students. Just as collaboration pushed teachers out of their typical interaction patterns, coaching pushed artists beyond their typical performance mentality toward a goal of helping others participate and learn. For example, this teacher was concerned that her students were learning to appreciate art by watching this coach *perform*, but they were not being given enough opportunity to participate in the artistic process themselves:

> He [the coach] comes out here and he entertains, and that's fine, but after an hour a week of him entertaining – I feel like it's cutting into my instruction time; the kids aren't getting anything. The kids aren't able to get things, but he does that because he likes doing it. And, I'm not a part of that; we're all watching the [coach] act. (fourth-grade teacher)

Collaboration can be a difficult process no matter who the participants, but collaboration between SUAVE teachers and artists sometimes resulted in tension because of the inexperience (on both sides) in collaborative endeavors, and the differing expectations and beliefs about the role of the arts and artists in education. The most prominent tension related specifically to the arts was the tension surrounding how to incorporate the artistic process into the teachers' already full curriculum.

Incorporating the Artistic Process

> *Fourth-Grade Teacher:* I didn't know what he [the coach] was doing, where he was going, and all of a sudden he's grabbing me, putting me on the spot in front of my kids, and I didn't know what the purpose of this was, and where we were going from, and ….yeah, I didn't like it…. I don't mind doing it, but let me know it's coming, you know, as one professional to another.
>
> *Coach of the Fourth-Grade Teacher:* I feel that I'm being used as a tool, used as somebody that happens to be in her [the teacher's] class… I feel that to her it is more important to complete her curriculum so the students complete this part

> rather than getting involved in the process. I haven't seen her willing to get involved doing things.

These quotes express a basic difference in the priorities of this teacher and this coach. The teacher wanted to plan ahead and know the coach's objectives. Other times, she stated this preference even more specifically: "I would like to know what's being taught, and what the skill is, and what it is that they are supposed to be receiving." This teacher also did not appreciate being asked to participate in something for which she was not well prepared. The coach, on the other hand, was most interested in getting everyone to *participate* in the artistic process. He was much less concerned with the specific curriculum objectives, and, in fact, took offense when the teacher made these objectives the priority. These tensions were extreme in this teacher-coach pair and are described in more detail in a paper by Goldberg and her colleagues (1999). However, similar tensions were expressed less extremely by many of the teachers and coaches.

Teachers live in a world of externally-defined and often overwhelming standards, tests, and curriculum. Thus the realities of their jobs encourage activities that are focused on accomplishing specific objectives in as short a time period as possible. McClure (1999) found that "the resource of time – that is, the lack of it to do the job well – is the single subject mentioned most often by teachers when they talk about the difficulty of improving their schools" (p. 64). In contrast, the artistic process in some ways encourages artists to transcend or at least ignore time pressures. This second-grade teacher, who is also an artist herself, described this tension between a time-conscious, objective-driven schedule and the artistic process:

> Before I started teaching, I was a sculpturist…and it's like you forget everything when you're doing art…whether your child has been fed or whether you've eaten…and I would just go into, it's called flow – I think that's the word for it –

> into flow when I was using clay. And I would forget everything but the clay and the experience of trying to make whatever shapes I was trying to put together... But in a classroom you've got different concerns. As an art teacher – you want everybody to be pretty successful and walk out of your classroom with this piece of artwork or something. And that's the way we were taught to teach, right? The artist doesn't have that same perception of time or the need that, at the end of this lesson, everybody's going to have a sculpture to walk out of there with. (second-grade teacher)

The tensions that arose when trying to incorporate the artistic process into the teachers' already overloaded schedule played themselves out in several forms. Teachers and coaches often disagreed about the level of importance of (a) artistic products (vs. the artistic process), (b) task completion (vs. exploration), and (c) planning (vs. spontaneity).

Artistic products vs. the artistic process. Teachers often desired students to leave with an artistic *product* – something that would show what the class had accomplished to both the students and the outside world. In contrast, the coaches focused on the artistic *process*. These differing goals became problematic when time was short and, in particular, when there was a set date by which the artistic product needed to be completed. For example, sometimes there were fixed performance dates for school plays or projects that needed to be completed because classes were going off-track. In these cases, the coaches often remained insistent on helping students experience the full artistic process, while the teachers' actions were typically driven by the logistical concerns of getting the product finished. In fact, one coach explained that her goal was to help teachers see value in the artistic process *whether or not a final product was completed in the allotted time frame*. She recognized that when the public sees an artistic performance or exhibition, they are only seeing the final product and thus may not consider the process part of the artistic endeavor. She viewed SUAVE coaching as an opportunity to help teachers understand and value the creation process:

> In the classroom, we're emphasizing more the process than the final product, and a lot of people can't make that connection between the final product and "Oh, there's this evolution that occurs, and if we never get to the finished product, there is something learned along the way. (coach)

Thus, while the coaches saw value in this creation process, teachers felt restricted by time pressures and thus sometimes needed to be convinced. Nonetheless, some of the teachers, such as this first-grade teacher, recognized this tension yet learned to understand and value the artistic process itself:

> Teachers get caught up in the product. I mean I think we know that we've done a good job and we can show somebody that we've accomplished something when we have a product and it's all over and hang it up on the wall, maybe. But the true learning really is the process and . . . I think I grew up thinking you created something and then it was done. It was over. It was perfect or not perfect, but you left it alone. They [the coaches] never left anything alone. They kept going back to it and adjusting or fine-turning or tweaking or whatever. And to begin with, part of me went "No No No, we're finished with that; let's just leave that." But in truth, I mean that is the artistic process to go back and think about it and feel about it for a while and then go back and change it if you want to change it, or do it again but in a little different way. That was kind of new for me. (first-grade teacher)

Task-completion vs. exploration. This process/product tension was seen not only in terms of artistic products but also in relation to the completion of any academic task. Teachers are used to staying focused on covering the curriculum. The coaches, on the other hand, valued and enjoyed exploration sometimes just for the sake of exploration. This tension particularly manifested itself when SUAVE coaches chose to spend time on something that, in teachers' minds, seemed unimportant and thus an unwise use of instructional time. Teachers felt that these extra activities distracted students from completing the intended tasks, and these time-consuming diversions created tensions for teachers who felt overwhelmed by an extensive curriculum that was already difficult to

cover in the time allotted. This fourth-grade teacher expressed this tension in the context of preparing for a play:

> I'll never forget the day he [the coach] did the cow. That little girl – she was so worried about her role and all she had to do was just stand there the whole time! And he took about ten minutes to show her what a cow is! And [another teacher] and I are looking at each other – like ten minutes! On a kid who doesn't have a speaking part?! But after that, this little girl had no more questions on what her role was . . . and she knew how to be a cow. He took the time, he mooed, he ate the grass, he rolled around – and the assistant superintendent came in! And [the coach] was on the ground with her at her level, and as teachers, we never would have done that. We would have said, "don't worry about it." But she really wanted to be coached on how to be a cow and she felt so important – just as important as the kids who had the speaking parts, just because he took the time with her to elaborate and explain. (fourth-grade teacher)

This same teacher later acknowledged that these seemingly unnecessary detours helped her recognize the value in taking the time to explore.

> I think it [SUAVE] is teaching us to be free and explore. Saying to a teacher, it's OK to do, it's not a waste of instructional time, it's valuable time the kids need. No one ever taught us that, and then through the artist … We're saying, "What's he doing?! It's taking him two weeks! I could have done that in five minutes." But then maybe it wouldn't have meant anything to [the students]. (fourth-grade teacher)

Other teachers expressed similar changes in their beliefs. Despite the time pressures inherent in teaching, they came to understand and value the artistic process of exploration -- even though this process requires time.

Planning vs. spontaneity. In addition to tensions surrounding the importance of completing a task (vs. simply exploring), teachers and artists often clashed over the importance of *planning* these tasks. Teachers are trained to carefully plan lessons, and lesson planning then becomes an expected part of the teachers' world (e.g., substitutes and some principals require detailed lesson plans from teachers). Nonetheless, teaching also involves a great amount of improvisation as teachers are consistently required to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

make on-the-spot decisions in response to students' comments, questions, facial expressions and so on (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1999; Huberman, 1993). However, these decisions are almost always in pursuit of pre-determined curriculum objectives, and the teachers themselves are in control of making these moment-to-moment decisions. The coaches, on the other hand, felt less restricted by these predetermined curriculum objectives and saw value in the creativity that can result from spontaneity. Thus, they would often seize the opportunity to take a lesson in a different direction than had jointly been agreed upon by the coach and teacher. Teachers were often uncomfortable with these lessons that followed whatever direction seemed to present itself, especially if it was the coach who determined what direction the lesson would take.

Tensions also sometimes arose because SUAVE did not have planning time built into the program structure, and thus teachers and coaches had little time to plan lessons collaboratively. Furthermore, some coaches did not value planning time and therefore did not work to fit it into their schedules. In short, while some planning did occur beforehand, many lessons were created collaboratively between the teacher and coach *while the lesson was occurring*. This spontaneity caused tension for many teachers, especially those who were used to making detailed lesson plans. However, some teachers grew to value a level of spontaneity:

> When I first started teaching, I felt like I had to know that every lesson was going to be successful before I attempted to teach it, and now I know that sometimes being willing to take a chance and to try something that you haven't tried before and gamble that it's going to work well, has opened up a whole lot of doors for my kids. (4/5 multi-grade teacher)

Despite comments like the one above, teachers continually asked for more planning time. Some coaches did recognize that spontaneous diversions, while benefiting students, might "not have gotten to the core of what the teacher needed to do." However, the coaches resisted completely abandoning the spontaneous aspect of their work. One coach articulated this resistance when he acknowledged that although he wanted to build more structure into his coaching so that teachers were clearer on the goals of the lessons, the materials, and so on, he was also concerned that in doing so, he might compromise the artistic process. He stated, "I hope I don't become a teacher ... totally structured. ... I want just to have the skeleton to play with and to build on top, and I feel I want to give a lot to the creative process."

The tensions surrounding planning have been and continue to be difficult ones for both teachers and coaches. SUAVE has recognized the importance of this issue and, therefore, has recently begun to provide time for planning. Currently, each coach is paid for eight hours of planning time although scheduling the actual planning sessions remains problematic. The hope is that planning sessions will give teachers and coaches time to address some of the tensions in a more relaxed setting in which they will not simultaneously have to deal with the pressures of teaching students.

Conclusions

The tensions of collaborating with artists and incorporating the artistic process have challenged SUAVE teachers to risk trying new things in their classrooms. In doing so, teachers have felt that they and their students have benefited. Thus, while this paper has highlighted tensions between teachers and coaches, it is important to remember that these

tensions have not prevented learning from occurring. On the contrary, in some cases, it was precisely these tensions that enabled learning to occur. For change to occur, Fullan (1999) underscored the importance of "keeping anxiety in balance, simultaneously provoking and containing it" (p. 61). The data suggest that the design of the SUAVE program has helped to both "provoke" and "contain" anxiety thus promoting teacher learning. The tensions have *provoked anxiety* in both teachers and coaches. However, certain structural components of the SUAVE program have helped to *contain this anxiety* and turn these tensions into learning opportunities. Specifically, SUAVE teachers have highlighted the following key structural components of the program: long term involvement, support communities, customized classroom coaching, and the program philosophy of teaching through the arts. Other professional development programs should take notice of these structural components since they have been successful in helping SUAVE teachers learn from tensions rather than simply being frustrated by them.

Long-term involvement. SUAVE helps contain anxiety by allowing sufficient time for tensions to be addressed and resolved. Teachers are given two years to explore teaching and learning through the arts. Since teachers and coaches often arrive with differing goals and priorities, this extended period of time allows them to negotiate common understandings. Furthermore, each teacher and coach are paired for an entire year. The long-term nature of this partnership provides an incentive for both participants to work though any serious differences so that the relationship can be both productive and enjoyable. Finally, each teacher has the opportunity to work with two different coaches as the coaches are rotated yearly. This rotation exposes teachers to more than one artist,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

each with a different artistic specialty and personality, thus broadening the teachers' experiences with and understanding of the artistic world.

Support communities. Anxiety can also be contained by the support provided by others engaged in the same experiences. In SUAVE, both teachers and coaches are supported emotionally and intellectually throughout the coaching process. First, since ten teachers per school participate in SUAVE, each teacher has nine immediate colleagues with whom s/he can brainstorm ideas and share activities, fears, and excitements. Furthermore, teachers also develop camaraderie with teachers from other schools as teachers from all SUAVE sites meet at the inservices. Second, all of the coaches are also supported. Each week, they meet as a group with the program director. During these meetings, they share artistic techniques and brainstorm ideas about potential lessons and ways to interact with teachers more effectively. In addition, the coaches provide an incredible support network for each other (for more information about the coaches meetings, see Goldberg, 2000).

Customized classroom coaching. The tensions between the teaching and artistic worlds are most obvious *in the classroom* when new ideas are being explored. SUAVE's weekly coaching pushes teachers to try new things, but, as one fifth-grade teacher explained, "with a safety net" since the coach is actually present when the teacher is taking these risks. Thus, teachers are held accountable for trying to teach through the arts, but this accountability comes with substantial *classroom* support that helps to contain anxiety. In contrast, many professional development programs provide great ideas at inservices but then teachers are expected to implement these ideas without any follow-up support in their classrooms.

The customized nature of SUAVE's coaching further helps contain teachers' anxiety. SUAVE coaches do not provide a canned program but rather negotiate with each teacher to provide individualized assistance. Thus, a teacher can more easily see the relevance of teaching through the arts *in his or her own classroom*. Through this customized coaching, students in SUAVE classrooms experience some incredible lessons, and it is the students' unexpected excitement and learning that often encourages teachers to continue trying new ideas.

Program philosophy of teaching through the arts. Given the pressures of an over-stuffed curriculum, tensions should be expected whenever teachers are asked to add anything else to the list of things they are required to cover. However, SUAVE's basic approach of emphasizing teaching *through* the arts (rather than *about* the arts) is a clever hook for enticing teachers to work with the arts. Rather than suggesting additional content, SUAVE helps to contain anxiety by presenting the arts as a teaching methodology that can be used to teach the *existing* curriculum in a different, and potentially better way. Interestingly, even though the program focuses on teaching core curriculum through the arts, teachers and students have also often become more interested in the arts themselves after seeing their power in other areas of the curriculum.

Final Thoughts

SUAVE has been a remarkably successful program in spite of, or perhaps because of, the tensions described in this paper. As Fullan and Miles (1992) and others remind us, risk taking is essential for real growth, and risk taking often derives from encounters with the unfamiliar. For many teachers, working so closely with the artistic world is risky, unfamiliar territory. This point was strongly and humorously made by one fourth-grade

SUAVE teacher who described her coach as "someone from outerspace." However, this teacher, and many others who faced tensions, have learned substantially through their participation in the program. The SUAVE program is structured to mitigate some of the potentially negative effects of these tensions, and instead, turn them into learning opportunities. If other professional development programs are to include experts outside of the field of education (as Ball and Cohen (1999) suggested), they will also need to expect tensions and consider how they will be able to promote learning from encounters with "outerspace." While SUAVE involves artists, other programs could involve professionals from other worlds, each with their own set of goals, values, and typical practices. In order to promote teacher learning, these programs will also need to develop structural components that can both provoke and contain anxiety (Fullan, 1999). SUAVE provides some suggestions for program design as well as providing an existence proof that education can learn from encounters with other professional worlds.

References

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Curriculum Update (1998, Spring). *Arts education: A cornerstone of basic education.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, T. R., Goldberg, M., Jacobs, V. & Wendling, L. (1999, April). *Teacher learning in professional development: The impact of an "artist as mentor" relationship.* Paper presented at the 1999 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

California Department of Education (CDE) Arts Work: Task Force on Arts Education (1997). *Current developments in arts education.* Sacramento, CA: CDE (Delaine Eastin, Superintendent).

Darling-Hammond, L. & McLaughlin, M. W. (1999). Investing in teaching as a learning profession: Policy problems and prospects. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 376-411). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. G. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel.* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. G. & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan, 7* (10), 744-52.

Goldberg, M. (1997). *Arts and learning: An integrated approach to teaching and learning in multicultural and multilingual settings.* New York: Longman.

Goldberg, M. (in press). *Arts and learning: An integrated approach to teaching and learning in multicultural and multilingual settings* (2nd edition). New York: Longman.

Goldberg, M. (2000, April). *Uncovering the effects of systematic and sustained programmatic support for professional developers: The role of structural support for the coaches in professional development programs.* Paper to be presented at the 2000 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Goldberg, M., Bennett, T., & Jacobs, V. (1999, April). *Artists in the classroom: A role in the professional development of classroom teachers.* Paper presented at the 1999 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Goldberg, M. R. & Bossenmeyer, M. (1998). Shifting the role of arts in education. *Principal*, 77 (4), 56-58.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Huberman, M. (1993). The model of independent artisan in teachers' professional relations. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts* (pp. 11-50). New York: Teachers College Press.

Jacobs, V. R., Goldberg, M., & Bennett, T. (in press). Uncovering an artistic identity while learning to teach through the arts. In D. Sherman & E. Mirochnik (Eds.), *Passion and pedagogy: Relation, creation, and transformation in teaching*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 16*, 297-351.

Little, J. W. & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). Introduction: Perspectives on cultures and contexts of teaching. In J. W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts* (pp. 1-8). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McClure, R. M. (1999). Unions, teacher development, and professionalism. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 63-84). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sparks, D. & Hirsh, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Thompson, C. L., & Zeuli, J. S. (1999). The frame and the tapestry: Standards-based reform and professional development. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 341-375). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Upitis, R., Soren, B. J., & Smithrim, K. (1998, April). *Teacher transformation through the arts*. Paper presented at the 1998 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.